

No part of the candidate's evidence in this exemplar material may be presented in an external assessment for the purpose of gaining an NZQA qualification or award.

S

93404A



934041

SUPERVISOR'S USE ONLY

OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP EXEMPLAR



NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY
MANA TOHU MĀTAURANGA O AOTEAROA

QUALIFY FOR THE FUTURE WORLD
KIA NOHO TAKATŪ KI TŌ ĀMUA AO!

Tick this box if you
have NOT written
in this booklet

☐

Scholarship 2022 Classical Studies

Time allowed: Three hours
Total score: 24

ANSWER BOOKLET

Check that the National Student Number (NSN) on your admission slip is the same as the number at the top of this page.

Write your answers to your THREE chosen questions in this booklet. Start your answer to each question on a new page. Carefully number each question.

Check that this booklet has pages 2–23 in the correct order and that none of these pages is blank.

YOU MUST HAND THIS BOOKLET TO THE SUPERVISOR AT THE END OF THE EXAMINATION.

Section A - Aristophanic Comedy - Question Nine

Peter Arnott says that Greek Comedy is not a comedy of characters, but of situations, and the validity of this statement depends on the definition of characters. 'Character' in Greek theatre, especially Greek comedy, did not exist in the same way that we think of character now. The advent of literary realism occurred more than two-millennia after Aristophanes' death, the contemporary Greeks did not think of the characters on stage as realistic figures who might exist in the real world. Instead they were allegories, exaggerated characteristics of society which might be extrapolated for a didactic or humorous effect. The entire nexus of Greek comedy is how these characters interacted with the world around them, showing how certain hyperbolic tendencies of society react with certain things. Based on this, 'character' as we think of now had nothing to do with Greek comedy, rarely would an audience member create an emotional bond with someone on stage. However, what that character on stage represents, and allegorizes, is the central device used in Aristophanic comedy, and that is more important than the situations the characters were put in.

A prime example of the importance of character in Aristophanic comedy is in the satirisation of real-life figures. Much of Aristophanes' comedy is based on the satirisation of real life people. There was an ancient Greek word, *Komoideumenoi*, that was used to describe the intended mocking of real life people. This shows how intrinsic it was to Greek comedy. If you were someone in Ancient Athens, chances are you're going to be mocked in Aristophanic comedy. Perhaps nowhere is there a better example of this than in *The Clouds*. *The Clouds* is an Aristophanic comedy that satirises the 'new way' of sophist thinking, and, in particular, Socrates. The mocking characterisation of Socrates was so scathing that Plato even denounced it as a primary contributing factor to why Socrates was forced to commit suicide. This characterisation begins from the start of the play, when we are first introduced to Socrates and he is hanging from the ceiling in a kind of basket device. His first lines in the play, in response to questioning over why he is doing this is 'I tread the air as I contemplate the sun'. This type of speech is almost an incredibly early predecessor to literary absurdism. Socrates, and by association philosophy, is shown to be utterly useless. In an age of hardship, as Athens was in at this point, to spend your days in a complicated contraption 'contemplating the sun' is ridiculous. It is truly absurd, and this hyperbolic satirisation of Socrates exemplifies the useless and stupidity of the Sophists. Another figure Aristophanes often targets in his comedy is Creon. Creon was a leading politician in Aristophanes' life, and came to represent the corruption and looming lack of freedom that Athens faced. The satire against Creon is even more vicious than that of Socrates, and far less veiled. Creon is allegorised in *The Wasps* as a 'rapacious looking creature, with a figure like a whale and a voice like a scaled sow'. This allegorical description of him is further extended when it is said that, 'around his grisly head lie the flickering tongues of servile flatterers'. Together these two depictions paint a picture of corruption and deceit around Creon. The first description given makes him seem positively beast-like, which connotes a lack of intellect and status (a common form of attack at Creon was his low birth). The second depiction draws heavily from serpentine lexicon, with flickering tongues around a grisly head calling to mind Medusa, who herself has the flickering tongues of serpents around her head. The invocation of snakes reinforces the way in which Creon has exacerbated the loss of Athenian virtue. At this point in Athenian history the state was suffering, and imminently they would lose democracy

briefly. Creon led this, and allegorised for many people an increase in corruption. Thus, as given from both of these examples, Aristophanic comedy is incredibly reliant on character. While situations, like Socrates hanging mid air, may extend the comedy of character, the primary focus is on the satirisation of real life figures, the komoideumenoi. The Athenians believed that theatre could change the direction and future of the polis, and as such they held the satirisation of powerful people in very high esteem, and viewed it as an essential part of the political process.

However it was not solely through the invocation of real-life people that Aristophanic comedy used characters. As previously mentioned characters were not realist depictions of people, but rather allegorical representations of ideals. Using these ideals in comedy could therefore create a salient social message about the morals and future of the polis and deme. A common allegorical message Aristophanes portrays through his characters is the generational divide between the old and young. This is perhaps most clearly represented in *The Wasps*. *The Wasps* is a play that revolves around a father-son duo, Philocreon and Bdelycreon. Throughout the play Bdelycreon is trying to 'cure' his father from his addiction to serving in juries. Philocreon is of the old generation, who fought against the Persians, and exemplifies the old traditional values of stubbornness, national pride, and virtue. He believes that to serve on a jury is his constitutional duty to Athens. Bdelycreon is of a younger, more cynical and more disillusioned generation. While written as the less heroic character, he shows genuine kindness to his father as he attempts to explain to him why he should not serve on a jury. The debate between these two characters in the first agon of this play serves as the principle didactic message Aristophanes is attempting to convey. Philocreon discussed that, by being on a jury, he is essentially a sovereign ruler of Athens, as he gets to make decisions that will change the direction of the citystate, enforcing its democracy. Philocreon would've come of age in the time of Pericles and the Persian war, where democracy was relatively new, and as such he worships it and holds it in high regard. In contrast Bdelycreon, a younger cynic who came of age in the time of rising corruption and Creon, argues that by being on a jury you are a slave to the polis. He explains that jurors only gain about 10 percent of the city's national surplus, with the rest going to the elected officials. He explains that because of this Philocreon is being used by the system because he is forced to work for a tiny proportion of the state's wealth, where people who don't participate in jury-duty get all the money. Their two different perspectives emerge from two different generational standpoints, and by highlighting this difference Aristophanes is showing the differences between the generations. The situation of Philocreon's jury-addiction is a set up for this debate, yet the principle didactic message is not about jury duty, but the generational divide. The situation does not explain this divide, rather it is exemplified by the allegorical characters Aristophanes uses in his plays. As such, character is more important in Greek comedy than situation.

Character in the modern sense doesn't exist in Greek comedy. Characters do not exist for us to conduct psychological insight into. If this is the lens that Peter Arnott is coming from in his analysis of Greek comedy then I would agree, it is not 'character based' at all in the modern sense. However neither is it a comedy of manners, where it is based on situations happening to characters. The allegorisation of character in Athenian comedy lends it to

provide poignant insight and didacticism to the people and audience who watch. The komoideumenoi can provide important insight into the deme of the polis as to the character of the people who lead them, and, if effective, the personal satire could change the direction of the political landscape. Similarly, important insights into the nature of social interactions and boundaries can be made through character interactions. The purported main function of Ancient Greek comedy was to provide a didactic message and teach the audience, and neither of those previously mentioned lessons can be taught through situations. Thus character is more important to the intent of Greek comedy than situation, and I disagree with the given quotation.

Section A - Roman Art and Architecture - Question Sixteen

Roman Art Architecture was a primary way for politicians or a ruler to portray a desired social message to the people. In a world of low literacy rates, sculpture and art were very effective ways to display a wide social message. Everything in Roman Art was allegorical, and sometimes this pertained to convey ideas to the Roman people about their duties and responsibilities.

This was even being done in the days of the late republic, as shown in *Patrician Carrying Busts*. This sculpture, created in the dying days of the Roman Republic, shows a patrician carrying masks of his ancestors. Ancestor worship was a huge part of Republican Roman sensibility, with politicians harkening back to and glorifying the feats and achievements of their ancestors as a way of glorifying themselves. This would often even go so far as certain Patrician houses, like the Julii and the Fabii, claiming descent from gods. This sculpture exemplifies this sensibility by showing the patrician (only patricians were allowed ancestor masks) holding the masks of his ancestors. However, this painting takes on an air of duty due to the stylistic features of its composition. This sculpture is done in a veristic manner, meaning it shows a 'warts and all' depiction. However the style of this sculpture is almost hyper-veristic, with an extreme accentuation of the patrician's facial 'flaws'. His skin is shown to be very wrinkled, eyebags are accentuated, and his entire body is hunched. This hyper-realism would have portrayed a sense of duty and service to the Roman people. Republican Romans viewed characteristics of old age not as flaws, but as signs of a life well lived. This man would appear to the Romans not as decrepit or sickly (as he may appear to us today) but rather as wise, strong, and weathered. This then proves as an allegory of this man's service and duty to the state of Rome, with hyper-realism being used to show age as a metaphor for duty and responsibility.

However, things alter slightly in the age of the empire. While some emperors portrayed themselves as in the service of the empire, others used portraiture to glorify and uplift themselves. This can be seen in the bust of Commodus. Commodus was an emperor who inherited a large amount of public goodwill from his predecessors. Before him was the reign of the '5 good emperors' who ruled Rome to her greatest extent, started numerous public works and social security schemes, and were overall beloved by the populace. As the first ruler after this period, Commodus' rule had high hopes, and he inherited good will from his predecessors. Because of this, he clearly saw no need in appeasing the people or portraying himself as a servant of the empire, rather he used portraiture to show himself as a mythological hero on par with Hercules. This larger than life bust shows Commodus in an idealised style, with hardly any marks on his smooth, perfect, muscular body. Historian R. Hannah describes the idealised style of this portraiture as 'Antonine Baroque' in reference to its sense of high drama, reinforced by stark juxtapositions between light and dark and the idealised skin (the coined term is in reference to the European Baroque, which also utilised these compositional elements). And while all of these elements would have been enough to sufficiently exemplify and uphold Commodus, he did not stop there. The main, striking feature of this bust is the numerable compositional comparisons to Hercules that he makes. In this bust Commodus is wearing the Skin of the Nemean lion, holding a Golden apple and wielding a huge club, all three of which were aspects of Hercules' mythological trials. Like

the European Baroque, this sculpture is intoxicated with its own sense of drama and greatness, and doesn't hold any real allegorical message for the Roman people; it is instead contempt to be in itself a ridiculous uplifting of a tyrannical despot.

However some Imperial portraiture was not like this, and instead did attempt to show rulers in an empathetic and caring manner. One such of these was the sculpture of Philip the Arab. Philip was a short-lived king in the middle of the crisis of the third century. This crisis was defined by a quick succession of emperors who were either murdered or killed on the battle-field, lots of foreign wars and multitudes of plagues. Philip inherited an empire on the brink of collapse, and as such he enjoyed none of the public goodwill that Commodus inherited. Due to this Philip could not afford to create an absurd image of him role-playing as Hercules, he reverted back to the veristic style of portraiture, creating an image of him deep in thought, probably with the intention of letting the Roman people know that they now have a ruler who cares about them. He does not seem like an idealised god, rather a realistic, ordinary man. However, Philip's portrait may not achieved the effect he especially desired. Scholarly opinions divide on the effect of Philip's quizzical expression. R. Hannah says it shows a caring emperor worried by the downward trajectory of his flailing empire. J. Campbell, on the other hand, says that Philip's portrait shows the face of a sadistic, power-hungry tyrant who killed Gordianus III, his predecessor, to gain power. Either might be true, and, either way, Philip's reign did not last long, so his public propaganda did not achieve the effect he wished it to. Either way, the veristic style of portraiture is a divergence from the weird, mythological-infused baroque idealism of Commodus', and that goes to show the way in which imperial portraiture can be allegorically infused to show a message of duty. The verism of Philip at the very least show someone who is worn down with experience, and this conveys ideas of the responsibility of public office, and the wearing down effect that duty has on someone.

The three sculptures mentioned all portray a different extent to how allegory can be used in Roman art. The first sculpture, of an unknown patrician politician, shows quiet dignity and pride in his ancestry. It was probably not created as a work of mass public propaganda, and as such it does not attempt to outwardly convey anything political, but it can be used as an example of how wearing public responsibility and duty can be. Philip the Arab was an emperor who desperately needed widespread public support. As such he created a veristic portrait which was an allegory of his intense political struggles, and, probably, his bleak political future. In a stark contrast to both of these, Commodus' portrait used allegory not to make him seem like a selfless or effective ruler, or even to show his quiet dignity, but rather it showed a picture of a self-aggrandized ruler who wanted to spend public income on making himself seem like Hercules. This arrogant, strange decision backfired, and Commodus was murdered in his reign.

Section B - Authority and freedom, Question Eighteen, Ancient Rome

Two incredibly valued traits in Ancient Rome were *Auctoritas* and *Dignitas*. *Auctoritas* roughly translates to 'Authority', and *Dignitas* does not have so easy a translation into the English language, yet it can be seen as a culmination of a person's personal virtue, his metaphorical worth, so to speak. When new Emperors or leading men took power in Ancient Rome, often by force through the backing of the military, it was crucial to prove to the larger Roman people that you were a person of value, who could rule wisely. Throughout the three pieces of evidence I will analyse today there is a sweeping trend of men, clamouring for power, attempting to prove to the Roman populace that they are men who are worthy of ruling Rome.

Plutarch's account of the assassination of Julius Caesar shows 'the conspirators', as they came to be known, attempting to control the tide of emotion running through Rome. Caesar had previously been named dictator for life, put on spectacular games for the people, and was even planning on a campaign to conquer Persia, bringing the Republic wealth and prestige. Due to all of this, he was loved by the populace, and killing him caused a huge power vacuum. Brutus and the conspirators knew this, and in order to stem the tide of Roman grief, he gave a speech to the people on the Capitol. Brutus and the conspirators wanted to restore the republic, and avoid the oncoming wave of imperialism that Caesar symbolised. Late Republican Rome had gone from a slew of dictators and powerful, dictatorial men for about a century at the time of Brutus' speech - The Brothers Gracchi, Marius, Sulla, Pompey, and now Caesar - and the Conspirators knew that there was a high chance that someone might come in and fill the power vacuum that Caesar left, and their dreams of a new, democratic republic would be lost. To prevent this, and attempt to present himself as a man of authority, Brutus presumably in his speech attempted to make himself seem like a man of *dignitas*, an appeal to the traditional republican values that him and the *optimates* valued so highly. This could potentially make him seem like the right man to lead the Republic to a safer and more democratic future; Brutus himself carried the name of the Man who, approximately 500 years earlier, had killed the last king and founded the republic. However, this plan to make him seem like a man of authority, who could lead the republic to freedom, was dashed when Cinna spoke badly of Caesar, and the public goodwill for the dead-dictator led them to revolt and drive the conspirators off the capitol. Overall, Plutarch's passage shows what a delicate political position the conspirators were in. They were attempting to save the Republic, yet killed a man the public held in very high esteem. Brutus attempted to show himself as a man of value and authority, and represent to the people that he was bringing them freedom from a new monarchy, yet he failed, and the people of Rome favoured the monarchical dictator over the 'liberators', as they (unsuccessfully) tried to brand themselves. This could lead to interesting conclusions to the value of political freedom in the Classical world. The Roman people, when given political freedom from a dictator, instead turned against their 'liberators' in memory of that dictator.

The political goals of the conspirators are also reinforced through coinage. Coins played an essential role in the Roman propagandist machine; they were small, easy to create, and were found in every corner of the empire. In a society where most provincial people could not properly read, nor could they travel to Rome and see the great propaganda of public monuments, coins were the best way to convey political messages. The conspirators tried to

weaponize coins to this point. After murdering Caesar they published coins of Brutus' face, next to the word '*Libertas*'. *Libertas* was the Roman Goddess of liberty and freedom. Roman politicians used Gods and Goddesses freely as political allegories. Instead of thinking of them as people with powers, as the Greeks did, the Romans viewed their gods as ethereal allegorisations of virtues and traits. Because of this, invoking *Libertas* as the conspirators do here would have been common practice, as it reinforces to all the people around the empire that the conspirators have political authority (they are linking themselves with the Gods), and that they are virtuous, as liberty and freedom were very valued traits. To this end the conspirators also invoked the father of Roman liberty, Lucius Junius Brutus, on the other side of the coin. Lucius Brutus, an ancestor of Marcus Brutus, killed Tarquinius Superbus, the last, tyrannical Roman king and founded the republic. In invoking him as Brutus' ancestor, the conspirators are attempting to convey to the Roman public that Marcus Brutus is the reincarnation of Lucius - he too killed a Roman monarchical figure and will establish a new, freer order. In this way, coinage is used to display how the conspirators established political freedom for all, and attempted to give themselves authority.

However, the paradigm of Roman political freedom and authority changed a lot over the course of the empire. The two aforementioned examples all happened in the late Republic era, but by the empire the values, and ways of gaining authority was very different. As shown in resource P(I), the Praetorian guard became inextricably tied to the power-dynamics of imperial Rome. As the only people who were allowed to carry weapons inside the boundaries of Rome, they were often involved in political assassinations and coups. The Praetorian Guard was involved in the murders of numerous Emperors, including Caligula and Domitian. Because of this power they were afforded, it was essential for a Roman emperor, upon assuming power, to win the guard over. This normally came in the form of donations and money, and it soon became common practice for a new emperor to pay the Praetorian guard exorbitant amounts of money to the end that they would protect him, and not kill him. As this shows, political freedom changed for politicians a huge amount over the course of the empire. While at one point it was sufficient for a new political leader to show themselves as men of *Auctoritas* and *Dignitas* now, in imperial Rome, money was the way to gain political power. This is also shown from a later relief, resource P(II). In this relief we see Marcus Aurelius, one of the five good emperors, dispensing goods and donations to the people. Bribing the people in this way was a crucial way of how Augustus came to power, and became a common practice to limit public dissent and the possibility of revolt. What these pieces, when put together, show is that money became essential to lasting political power in Rome. As an emperor, it became necessary to both pay off the political establishment (as allegorised by the Praetorian Guard) and the people if you wanted a safe, effective reign.

These four pieces of evidence, when put together, show the changing social and political paradigm of Rome across multiple centuries. In order to be an effective politician, it was once enough to be a man of *Dignitas*, and this would then grant you *Auctoritas*. Brutus was a politician who thought such, who worshipped old republican values, and he died for it. The way the republic used to function was no longer working, and it was no longer enough to simply exemplify traditional values, as many successful stoic politicians did do in the earlier

republic. This dramatic shift is then seen in the two imperial reliefs analysed. Instead of being men of exemplary and outstanding character, the emperors now had to pay off and bribe officials and the people to keep their life and position. A vast shift had taken place, and political freedom for politicians had dramatically decreased, with murders and assassinations now far more common place than in the early republic, and bribery, something once abhorred, now common practice for an emperor to keep his life. Furthermore, political freedom for the people had also decreased, with them now no longer involved in the political process but rather subjects under an absolute monarchy.

Outstanding Scholarship Exemplar 2022

Subject	Classical Studies	Standard	93404	Total score	19
Q	Score	Annotation			
1	7	The position taken is strong but is argued well in a thoughtful manner. The knowledge is very detailed and the presentation is assured with a sophisticated style. There is a focus on character but situation is also addressed to achieve a balanced response.			
2	6	The answer is well written and articulate with a strong appreciation of context. There is not perhaps quite the same degree of balance in approach; duty is not addressed to the same degree as responsibilities. Selection of evidence could have taken more note of the Imperial context although the Republican example was made relevant to the question.			
3	7	A coherent response was produced from across the sources showing very good insight. There is a focus on the source material and a detailed understanding of context has been introduced into the analysis.			